



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sense of the word be a critic of the Pentateuch, and this is a phase through which the American discussion must pass if it intends to reach tangible results and lawful conclusions.

Not that all the work is to be done in the private study. Magazines devoted to biblical research, such as the *Hebraica*, could from time to time bring from the pen of competent men a proposed analysis of this or that section as a sample, or of especially difficult sections for special assistance. But even here the student must follow step by step the work of the writer. Of course the work would have to be begun by those who are convinced that the Pentateuch is a composition from various documents; on them lies the *onus probandi*. For the present it will suffice to have drawn attention to the character of the Old Testament discussions and to have stated what, in our view, is the only thorough and satisfactory foundation for its further prosecution and development.

---

## STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

### III.

#### Tradition, in its Relation to History; (1) To History in General.

##### II.

So far we have noticed some of the ways in which tradition on the one hand and history on the other originate and grow. The chief question remains—How do these two, history and tradition, stand related, one to the other?

##### 1. THE HISTORICAL BORDER-LAND.

There is a point in the secular life of the world where we find history and tradition meeting in a kind of border-land. This point of contact is, perhaps, best represented in Herodotus, born in the year B. C. 484. His birth-place, the city of Halicarnassus, in Caria, a province of Asia Minor, was at the time under Persian rule. How he collected his materials for history is illustrated in these few sentences by Prof. Jebb, of Glasgow: "Favored by his two-fold quality as a Persian subject and a Greek citizen, he traversed almost the whole of the known world, from Ecbatana, Susa and Babylon in the east, to South Italy in the west, from the northern shores of the Black Sea to the first cataract of the Nile, an area of about 1,700 square miles. No Greek before him had explored foreign lands so widely and so intelligently." The purpose of these travels, as we know, was to gather materials for his history. He is often called "the Father of History;" one might with equal propriety call him "the Father of the Interviewers." The newspaper reporter of our time is not more omnipresent and persistent than this insatiable querist, penetrating everywhere and questioning everybody. Of course, he heard and wrote down many an extraordinary story, and many a childish one. Prof. Jebb speaks justly of his "child-like simplicity," and yet says, truly, that "he is one of the most delightful of story-tellers." "Often," it is added, "he stops to tell some quaint little story by the way—like that of Hippo-

cleides, a noble suitor for the daughter of the great prince, Cleisthenes, who pained his intended father-in-law by dancing before the company, and finally stood upon his head. Cleisthenes, who had hitherto restrained himself, exclaimed, 'Son of Tisandrus, you have danced off the marriage,' but Hippocleides replied, 'Hippocleides does not care.' Hence, says Herodotus, our proverb. All which is very much as if some future historian were to set himself, seriously, to study up the origin of the expression, "Barkis is willin'." It is good interviewer's gossip, but queer history.

But the important thing is that in the pages of Herodotus history and tradition are face to face. Readers of him have long since given up all idea of absolutely depending upon him; and still, few writers of ancient history, perhaps no writer, is quoted more often than Herodotus, while to deny that his work is of immense value as history, is to do him great injustice. Even that in it which is tradition rather than history is of value; for in the tradition one sees that there is usually, perhaps always, an historical germ. To find this is often an interesting inquiry, and not always, by any means, without some satisfaction in the result. It has been a question amongst writers almost from his day to our own, how much of what we find in him is real history; but his interesting narratives, like that of the visit of Solon of Athens to Cræsus, king of Lydia, and incidents and conversations between Cræsus and Cyrus, when the latter had taken his capital, Sardis, first condemning him to be burnt upon a funeral-pile, then releasing him and making him his friend and counsellor ever after; and what he tells of Tartessus, the Scriptural Tarshish, in the far West, by the Straits of Gibraltar;—these with marvellous legends of primitive ages, related to him by the Egyptian priests; such as these in the form they have in his book cannot, perhaps, be received, and still, applying to them just principles of historical criticism, it has been found possible to get out the kernel of history and turn it to good account, whatever may be done with the shell.

The poems of Homer afford another interesting example. Some remarks of Mr. Gladstone, one of the most accomplished Homeric students of our time, are very interesting in dealing with this subject. He states his point in this way: After declaring his belief in "the truth of the Trojan war as history," he says: "The historical character of the poems, in the inner sense of the term, is independent of what may be called their technical or formal truth. Even if the facts were exaggerated, or otherwise altered for the purpose of poetical effect, nay, even if invented for that purpose, the poems might still be historical in the most material respects. All those glimpses of the prior and general history of the race which they permit rather than promise, might still be correct to the letter. The portraiture of religion, manners, institutions, arts, might be entirely trustworthy. The psychology of the poems in the largest sense might be true; the state and scale of the human mind, thought, language and character, might be the same; just as in the Carolingian and Arthurian romances, we never regard the truth of the manners as dependent upon the truth of the facts." In his development of the subject, Mr. Gladstone justifies this view in details which make it quite clear that in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, with all their evidences of supreme inventive power on the part of the poet, and the fact, also, that the story is strung, all through, upon a thread of tradition, he sees really a vast amount of primitive history.

A book has recently been published, some parts of which are of interest in this connection. It is Dr. Schliemann's second and final book, "*Troja*," giving an

account of his labors in excavating on the supposed site of Troy, on and near the hill Hissarlik, in the northwestern corner of Asia Minor. I believe that the opinion of competent persons is steadily growing that Dr. Schliemann has really brought to light what remains of that ancient city of Priam. And it is quite noticeable how his discoveries invest with reality the incidents of Homer's great epic. He locates gates named in the poem, remnants of the walls and towers from which citizens and warriors watched the fortunes of the fight in the plain below; the temples to which votive offerings were borne, with supplications for the favor of the gods, the famed Scamander flowing near, and even the springs, with their outlet into the river, where Hector and Achilles fought the deadly duel so fatal to Troy; while, perhaps most interesting of all, is the fact that this city, whose remains he finds deep down under the ruins of four or five other cities which have been rebuilt and have perished since that old city of Priam on the site of the real Troy, itself perished in just such a tremendous conflagration as that from the midst of which, according to Virgil, Aeneas bore his old father Anchises, leading his little boy Ascanius by the hand. A rich treasure is found, including some 10,000 different objects of value, many of them in the precious metals, yet all showing the action of intense heat. "Of the weapons," he says, "found in the largest gold-treasure, one bronze dagger has been completely curled up in the conflagration; a mass of lance-heads, daggers, and battle-axes, have been fused in the intense heat; there are further lance-heads fused to battle-axes, and a lance and battle-ax firmly fused to a copper caldron." All over this hill of Hissarlik at the depth where these things are found, are signs of the terrible flame whose intensity and fury those of us who saw Chicago burning a few years since can perfectly well understand. It may be not unlikely that in some future time, visitors will flock to this site of old Troy, Iliad and Æneid in hand, and trace out incidents of the great story, some of them at least historically identified, under all the fiction of the poems.

Tradition is in its way almost a more fascinating study than history itself, and it has its value, and its valuable results for the historical student.

## 2. MUST BE SHARPLY DISCRIMINATED.

But then, in the next place, history and tradition must be sharply discriminated. Thucydides, as we well know, is a very different sort of historian from Herodotus. Though born only thirteen years later, he seems in the character of his mind, and the critical judgment displayed in his history, almost as if he might have been separated from him by centuries. That which Mr. Grote calls "the historical sense" abounds in Thucydides, but is very deficient in Herodotus. What Thucydides himself says of his work characterizes this difference very justly, while one seems to perceive in it a sly thrust at his predecessor in the same line of authorship. "The absence of romance in my History," he says, "will perhaps lose it the popular ear. But it will be enough if it is judged useful by those who may desire an accurate knowledge of the past as a clue to that future which, in all human probability, must repeat or resemble the past. It has been composed not as the exploit of an hour, but as a possession for all time."

That is what history is, "a possession for all time." It is more than an interesting story. It is not *fable*, but *truth*. I cannot go very fully into the various rules of historical criticism by which this needed distinction is made. To a certain extent, a narrative of real events bears its truthfulness upon its face, while a traditional one may be detected by its own evident character, as legend. When, in

the Chaldæan account of the Flood, we are told how while men and their works were destroyed on the earth, "in heaven the gods became afraid of the water-spout and sought a refuge: how they ascended even to the heaven of Anu"—that is to the highest heaven; how they "were stretched motionless, pressed against each other like dogs"; how "the gods on their chairs were seated in tears—and they kept their lips closed, meditating on future things",—such an element as this in the story makes it impossible to receive it as history. Still, even as tradition, we treat it otherwise than as a pure invention. In the Genesis narrative we have the history; and this traditional account of the same general event becomes of value not for its own sake, but because it shows that there were legends of the Flood as well as a history of the Flood. So the tradition, in a certain way, testifies to the history. And this is, in one aspect of it, the relation between the two.

Then, history is self-consistent. Of this the Bible history is a very remarkable example. Has it ever occurred to the reader how absolutely true to itself the Bible is, as respects its historical element, as well as in other respects? Not laboriously so. Not as if all the while on its guard. Nothing is more conspicuous in it than its freedom of movement, the dignity of its attitude, so to speak its defiance of misconstruction and assault. It is, in its literary form, never out of keeping with the age that produced it. From the simplicity of an utterance often singularly primitive, it ranges all along the line of various expression and style, to that which is most sublime in the poetical, most severe in the logical, most plain and mere matter-of-fact in the historical. We are sometimes at a loss how to interpret it; but whenever we do reach a solution we find "the harmony of Scripture" still undisturbed. Wherever we come upon later allusions to the earlier history, those allusions are faithful to the original record in every particular. This is true down to the latest chapters of the New Testament. The Apocalypse is seen to be, as we study it, though with special meaning and design, almost a panoramic *resume* of the whole Old Testament story; till in its closing chapters, the twenty-first and twenty-second, you have that original picture of the original paradise reproduced, only now on its redemptive and heavenly side. What a marvel of unity and consistency is the Hebrew history! Many pens are employed upon it, in some cases at intervals of centuries. Yet the story is one. I do not believe that I run any hazard in saying that no history has ever been written, in any age, with various authors concerned in it as is the case with all history, that can deserve comparison with Bible history, as respects this element of absolute consistency and unity. How different with tradition! It changes according to the fancy or prejudice of writers or narrators; tells now one story and now another; changeful as the figures in a kaleidoscope. Now the element of truth is almost lost amidst the invention of polytheism, now dimly traceable amidst the puerilities of races scarcely advanced beyond childhood, and now transfigured by the inventions of poets and the creations of mythology. Here again we say of history and tradition in their mutual relation that you can never put one in the place of the other.

Then, there is in history a self-authenticating principle, characterizing it as history. Very ancient history, as written now, may be dependent to a considerable extent upon the reliability of other histories written long ago. But when Thucydides, or Xenophon, or Livy, or Tacitus wrote, the sources and proofs used by each of these, perhaps documentary, perhaps found in the recollections of living men, perhaps in some measure traditional, were such in their nature that what was thus writ-

ten took its place as history, and has held that place to this day. Modern history has the advantage of appealing to documents preserved in national archives, or to other sources of proof, for establishing the truth of its narrative. It goes upon record as history, and however parts of it may be criticized or doubted, as a whole it is recognized as historical. We cannot tell, at this late day, what documentary or other sources of knowledge, as to facts, apart from inspiration, Moses may have had. But his writings from the first were to the Hebrews even without reference to his character as an inspired man, all that those of Thucydides were to the Greeks, all that those of Tacitus were to the Romans, all that those of Gibbon and Bancroft are to us. The history authenticated itself at the time and in the way proper to history, and its author took his place among historians of the world. You can no more put the Chaldean and Babylonian myths in a like position than you can do any other impossible thing. There is no reason to believe that they ever were history, in any other sense than that very imperfect one which is true of all tradition.

It may be of service to the reader if I quote, here, in brief, those laws of historical criticism which are generally recognized in questions of this nature and which Mr. Rawlinson (*"Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Record"*) has formulated, as follows :

1. When the record which we possess of an event is the writing of a contemporary, supposing that he is a credible witness, and had means of observing the fact to which he testifies, the fact is to be accepted as possessing the first or highest degree of historical credibility.

2. When the event recorded is one which the writer may reasonably be supposed to have obtained directly from those who witnessed it, we should accept it as probably true, unless it be in itself very improbable. Such evidence possesses the second degree of historical credibility.

3. When the event recorded is removed considerably from the age of the recorder of it, and there is no reason to believe that he obtained it from a contemporary witness, but the probable source of his information was oral tradition; still, if the event be one of great importance, and of public notoriety, if it affected the national life, or prosperity,—especially if it be of a nature to have been at once commemorated by the establishment of any rite or practice,—then it has a claim to belief as probably true, at least in its general outline. This, however, is the third, and a comparatively low, degree of historical credibility.

4. When the traditions of one race, which, if unsupported, would have but small claim to attention, and none to belief, are corroborated by the traditions of another especially of a distant or hostile race, the event which has this double testimony obtains thereby a high amount of probability, and, if not very unlikely in itself, thoroughly deserves acceptance.

These canons of historical criticism place the relations of history and tradition in a very clear light. In view of them, and in view of all that has thus far been said upon this subject, we might summarize by saying (1) that tradition is a part, often a valuable part, of the *material* of history; (2) that tradition often serves, sometimes in a very important way, as a testimony to the *truth* of history.

### 3. HISTORY, NOT TRADITION, THE VEHICLE OF REVELATION.

I touch only one point more, and that briefly. It is history and not tradition, that must be the vehicle of revealed religion. This brings us to the topic of the next general study upon our main subject; but it must be noticed here, also, as the real aim of the discussion thus far. There are places in the Bible which make us see, very clearly, what importance inspiration itself attaches to its own historical element;—for example, the words with which the evangelist Luke opens his

Gospel: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed amongst us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee, in order, most excellent Theophilus; that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." And in fact, unless the New Testament history is absolutely reliable, and reliable in every part, what basis of faith have we? If some portion be doubtful, that makes the whole doubtful; and *the facts* of the Gospel discredited, its doctrines are left with nothing on which to stand. Hence the emphasis with which an apostle declares that the Gospel history is not a tissue of "cunningly devised fables;" placing it thus in a position apart from all the other religions of the world.

It seems to me, too, that one reason of the frequency with which the phrase occurs, "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled," is that thus the newer record may authenticate and confirm the older one. It is not, simply, that the type and the prophecy may bear witness to him who is the Anti-type, and the Fulfillment; not alone that it may be seen how clearly the holy men of old foresaw the Coming One; but that he himself, when he had come, might be as if writing his own shining name across every page of that former Scripture, giving to it, thus, his own divine indorsement as authentic and true.

In these times, it is a very common thing to meet with the phrase, "Hebrew tradition," in allusion especially to the earlier parts of the Old Testament record. This is not always with any purpose of disparagement; yet I think the phraseology itself indicates a drift of opinion. It is a matter of profound importance that the basis on which the whole structure of revelation rests, should be received as *history*, not as tradition; as history alone, and not as history *and* tradition. We cannot recognize the latter word, in this connection, even in any modified sense of its meaning. Wherever the inspired writer obtained his material, however his facts came to him, in his hands they became historical; and they are given to us through inspired men, in order that we also may know "the *certainty* of those things wherein we have been instructed;" and in order that, thus, the religion of the Bible may, amidst the crowd of false religions, stand, in this respect as in others, apart and alone.

I have, now, in this discussion, sought to recognize in tradition all that may, with any justice, be claimed for it. There is an historical element in it; its origin, absolutely considered, is the same as that of history—that is to say, in the historical impulse in man. But, in no adequate sense is it history. Often it lends testimony to the historical, as in the case of the Chaldean legend of the Creation, the Flood and the Confusion of Tongues. Often there is an historical germ in it, which it is both interesting and profitable to search for. But the two must be sharply discriminated. Narratives which carry truthfulness in their very face; which are self consistent, and which in the way proper to history have been duly authenticated, we have no right to speak of, in any vague way, as traditional; least of all when, in so doing, we discredit what is not only true in itself, but what divine Providence may have ordained as the record of His own dealings with the human race. This He has done in the case of revealed religion, of which the history of a chosen people was anciently made the vehicle and the witness. This one

true religion stands forever in contrast with all false religions, in this : that while *they* are mythical, traditional, deformed with monstrous or absurd inventions, *it* finds a basis of fact in a history which from beginning to end is harmonious, consistent, authentic and true ; so that those who receive it can know the "*certainty* of those things wherein they are instructed."

---

## THE WORD "CONSCIENCE" IN THE BIBLE.

BY REV. MAURICE G. HANSEN,

Brooklyn, New York.

It is a singular fact that the Hebrew language contains no term to designate the faculty of the soul which is called the conscience. Hence, we look in vain for the word in the historical records, the prophetic teachings, the devotional songs, or the prayerful utterances in the Old Testament. In the New Testament, however, we meet with it (*συνειδήσις*) frequently, especially in the addresses (Acts XXIII., 1 ; XXIV., 16) and the epistles of St. Paul, who, if the epistle to the Hebrews is also to be regarded as from his pen, employed it twenty-seven times. If the statement concerning the absence of the word conscience from the Old Testament should be confronted with the citation from Eccl. x., 20, "Curse not the king, no, not in thy conscience" (LXX. *συνειδήσις*), it may be replied that in King James' version of that text the translation "conscience" could not have been expected. The Hebrew מַדְע certainly does not express in this instance what we understand by *συνειδήσις*, *conscientia*, conscience, as used by Paul and Peter. Even the Seventy render it differently in 2 Chron. I., 10. "Give me now wisdom and knowledge (*σύνεσις*, applied in the classics, according to Liddell and Scott, even to animals), and in Dan. I., 4, "understanding science (*φρόνησις*). If for "conscience," in the passage in Eccl., the expression "secret thought" had been substituted, the true sense of מַדְע would have been brought out, as in the Vulgate (*cogitatio*), in the "Staten-bybel" (*Gedachte*) and in Luther's translation (*Herz*).

But now the query arises, Can the absence of the word from the Old Testament be accounted for ? Certainly not upon the ground that the patriarchs, the prophets, the singers of Israel knew not what Socrates and Plato knew and named,—this intuition of right and wrong, this sense of duty, the combination of both, and beyond these, the conviction, as Principal Shairp expressed it in his "Reasonableness of Faith," that there is something behind which will ultimately uphold these verdicts, and in the long run will bring it to pass that it shall be well with the righteous and ill with the unrighteous. The "something" to the most enlightened of the Pagans, was the "Some One" to those who bowed in worship, not to an "unknown God." In that the devout Jew had the knowledge of the Holy One who is the Lord of the conscience, he was better able than the devout Pagan to recognize that point of contact in man between himself and a divine revelation of the right and the just, which the conscience in its innermost essence really is. But for the very reason that in this respect he was more favored than the Pagan, he was disposed to view the oneness of his conscience with the divine judgments, on the God-side of it. Unto this all his training tended. From without came to